perhaps in the Jew a mental attitude which qualifies him peculiarly to collaborate in brushing away the cobwebs of the dead conventions, though rendering him no less receptive of prevailing tendencies.

The Jew, hence, is very often found in the vanguard of a new movement. But, on the other hand, he is less frequently responsible for the first revolutionary step He generally works through the medium most favoured at the time; with the romantics he is romantic, with the impressionists impressionistic, and with the moderns ultra-modern. There may conceivably be something Jewish in the essence—a feeling that spirit is more important than form, or some other mystical abstraction which defies analysis. In certain instances, there is a tendency to seek relief from everyday drabness in a riot of colour. There is generally (as indicated elsewhere) a warm feeling of humanity. This, however, is all that can be conceded. The style is that of the moment; the subject is the environment, or what is demanded by convention. Thus Israels, Auerbach, Levitan, were the interpreters in paint or in prose of the Dutch, German, Russian countryside: only, coming out as they did from the obscurity of the Ghetto, they were perhaps able to see in it more than those whose fathers had been famffiar with its tints and folds and figures for centuries past.

If there is any other common factor about the Jews' contributions to art, music and letters, it is due to the simple fact that, forming as they do a single sociological group and being brought up in a similar

environment, they tend to reflect something of that group's outlook. There are signs that a new art, in the wider sense, may perhaps develop in Palestine. But it is an art rooted in the European milieu and using a European technique. If anything specifically Jewish may evolve, it is still to make itself known.